

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of

Extension of Section 272 Obligations of)	
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company in the)	WC Docket No. 02-112
States of Kansas and Oklahoma)	
)	

MCI COMMENTS

WorldCom, Inc. d/b/a MCI (MCI) hereby submits its comments on the Petition of AT&T Corporation (AT&T) in the above-captioned proceeding.

MCI agrees with AT&T that the Commission should retain the section 272 separate affiliate requirement for SBC's in-region interLATA services in Kansas and Oklahoma for a minimum of three additional years. Because the issues raised by AT&T's petition are closely related to the issues examined in the ongoing WC Docket No. 02-112 section 272 sunset proceeding, the Verizon-New York section 272 sunset proceeding, and the SBC-Texas section 272 sunset proceeding, MCI hereby incorporates its comments in those proceedings by reference.¹

MCI emphasizes, however, that allowing the SBC-Kansas and SBC-Oklahoma section 272 safeguards to expire would be premature if only because the Commission has open proceedings that address precisely the issues raised by the pending expiration of the Kansas and Oklahoma section 272 safeguards. In particular, the Commission

¹ WorldCom Comments, WC Docket No. 02-112, August 5, 2002; MCI Comments, WC Docket No. 02-

should retain the Kansas and Oklahoma section 272 safeguards until it has determined, based on the record developed in response to the Section 272 Sunset NPRM, “whether, and, if so, under what conditions, the structural and nondiscrimination safeguards established in section 272 should be extended by the Commission”²

Certainly, the Commission should not permit the Kansas and Oklahoma section 272 safeguards to sunset until it has determined whether alternative safeguards should be imposed instead. In the Section 272 Sunset NPRM, the Commission asked the public to comment on whether alternative safeguards should take the place of the section 272 safeguards, if the section 272 safeguards were permitted to sunset.³ More recently, the Commission issued a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to examine the regulatory requirements that would be applicable to an RBOC if the section 272 requirements were allowed to sunset.⁴ Commissioners Adelstein and Copps, in their Dissent from the December, 2002 Sunset Order, were concerned that by simply allowing the Verizon-

112, May 12, 2003.

² Section 272(f)(1) Sunset of the BOC Separate Affiliate and Related Requirements, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, WC Docket No. 02-112, released May 24, 2002, at ¶ 9, 23.

³ Id.

⁴ Section 272(f)(1) Sunset of the BOC Separate Affiliate and Related Requirements, Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, WC Docket No. 02-112, released May 19, 2003.

New York section 272 safeguards to expire, “the Commission ha[d] neglected to consider whether there is a need for these or alternative safeguards.”⁵

Respectfully submitted,
WORLDCOM, INC. d/b/a MCI

/s/ Alan Buzacott

Alan Buzacott
1133 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 887-3204

December 22, 2003

⁵ Section 272(f)(1) Sunset of the BOC Separate Affiliate and Related Requirements, Memorandum Opinion and Order, WC Docket No. 02-112, released December 23, 2002 (Sunset Order), Joint Statement of Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein and Commissioner Michael J. Copps.